

Illinois Commerce Commission
SBC/Ameritech Illinois Merger, Docket 98-0555
Performance Benchmarks Collaborative, Condition 30
Final Conference Call Meeting Minutes From 2/28/2000
Modified and Approved 3/28/2000

Administrative Notes

Mr. McClerren opened the meeting and asked that Ameritech be responsible for the notes from this meeting. Draft meeting minutes from 2/14 and 2/15 as well as these will be reviewed at the next meeting in Chicago on March 28 & 29.

Issues to discuss today include:

- PM # 93 – Partial LNP Conversions, Technical Feasibility
- PMs #5, 6, 94 – FOC Measures, Parity or Benchmark

PM #93 – Partial LNP Conversions

Review: Performance Measure #93 provides a comparison of due dates on partial LNP conversions. The comparison is based on the due date of the service order for the numbers that the CLEC is porting and the due date of the service order for those numbers being left in place by the CLEC. In Ameritech region only one service order is currently used in this provisioning process, therefore only one data point exists. In Southwestern Bell, two service orders exist and therefore the comparison of the dates is reasonable. Ameritech contends that while the process exists as currently defined, there are two options, report 100% compliance or declare the measure technically infeasible.

The CLEC position is that there is work in progress at SBC to change this process, which would result in a standard process using two service orders. This is being driven by SBC California (PacBell).

Discussion resulted in a decision to continue to report the measure. Ameritech re-iterated that it would be reporting 100% until and unless the process changed. CLECs agreed to this process for the interim.

FOC Measurements

Unsolicited FOC review:

Ameritech provided an update of the work completed to date to address unsolicited FOCs. Ameritech has re-established a team that is reviewing and re-writing the Methods and Procedures (M&P) for Service Representatives. This new M&P will be reviewed with each one. Process and minor system improvements have also been designed and are being implemented. Ameritech expects that these improvements, coupled with the move to LSOG 4, will address the problem. The LSOG4 implementation changes the way these notifications are sent to CLECs to jeopardy notices. Ameritech is also exploring other alternatives to provide jeopardy notices earlier than LSOG 4 implementation (late August).

Parity vs. Benchmark for FOCMeasurements

Ameritech reviewed its view that there is no retail analog for Firm Order Confirmation (FOC).

Retail orders flow downstream after passing the system edits in the Ameritech ordering system. CLEC orders are edited first on the CLEC system passed through the interface and re-edited again for input into the Ameritech ordering system. The additional process of a confirmation is established to support the carrier to carrier relationship in sending this order. CLECs have the opportunity to contract with Ameritech to implement a direct input into the Ameritech service order system as documented in the merger agreement. Only with a direct interface will they get the immediate results that a retail representative gets, but they will not get a firm order confirmation. The order will just proceed downstream.

Ameritech proposed adding a measurement similar to that which has been established in Bell Atlantic, which evaluates FOC response time for flow-through orders. Bell Atlantic offers a FOC response <2 hours on flow-through orders, Ameritech offered a one hour benchmark to address this issue.

CLECs proposed that Ameritech look at the PacBell standard which is twenty minutes. Ameritech and Sprint responded that this benchmark is being re-evaluated in PacBell.

CLECs did not agree to the Ameritech proposal on a new flow-through FOC measurement. They maintained the view that there is a retail analog and that the FOC response should be much compared to the “retail FOC”.

Ameritech will report in the 150 day filing with the commission that the one issue that could not be resolved was FOC parity vs. benchmark.

Other Issues

A question about new measurements such as Jeopardy measurements, were we going to discuss these in the 150-day filing? Mr. McClerren noted that the merger agreement established a period of at least one-year for collaborative meetings. During this time CLECs will be able to bring new measurements to the table. Any issues that cannot be resolved may ultimately be resolved at the commission.

CLECs also proposed a need to address the Texas Remedy plan. Ameritech has already stated (first collaborative meeting) that Ameritech will implement the Texas plan per the merger agreement. Should there be a need to discuss this plan further at the collaborative sessions, we can add it to a future agenda.

March 6 Reporting Deadline

Ameritech will provide a draft of the 150 day filing to all participants on the distribution list by March 1st 9:00 AM. CLECs are to provide comments back by 9:00 AM on March 3rd. The document will include:

- What measures are to be implemented
- Listing of Technically Infeasible Measures
- Status on Parity vs. Benchmark as resolved at the collaborative
- FOC parity vs. benchmark as not resolved (provide Ameritech position)
- Implementation Schedule

March 28 Meeting

Mr. McClerren thanked the parties and re-iterated that he felt great progress had been made in the collaboratives to date. The date for the next meeting was reviewed as detailed below and the conference call concluded.

March 28 1:00 PM – 5:00 PM,

March 29 9:00 AM – 3:00 PM in Chicago

Send requests for the meeting agenda by March 15, 2000